

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/871,081	05/31/2001		Dae-Sik Oh	1639	9317
28005	7590	12/27/2004		EXAMINER	
SPRINT				DEAN, RAYMOND S	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100				2684	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/871,081	OH, DAE-SIK
Advisory Notion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Raymond S Dean	2684
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	tion. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire It ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content o	divisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFF f extension and the corresponding amounted the shortened statutory period for reply of the shortened statutory period for the sh	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C  1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF)	FR 1.704(b).  Brief must be filed within the pe	riod set forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		and apposit
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further		ee NOTE below)
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	see the tE selent,
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	<b>,</b>	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .		
Claim(s) objected to: None.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 - 23</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<del>.</del>
10. ☐ Other: NAY MAUNG	/ a	Pend le Dr
SUPERVISORY PATENT	EXAMINER	Raymond S. Dean December 13, 2004

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The cited references more than adequately support the rejection of the claims.